

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 has been amended.

Claim 3 has been cancelled.

The disclosure is objected to because of the informalities. The specification has been amended to correct the informalities. Thus, the objection as it applies to the disclosure is moot.

Claim 12 is objected to because of the informalities. Claim 12 has been amended to correct the claims status identifier from “currently amended” to “previously presented.” Although the claims status identifier for claim 12 must be “new” at the previous amendment, now it is to be “previously presented” because claim 12 was already entered at the previous amendment. Thus, the objection as it applies to claim 12 is moot.

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stewart et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,019; hereinafter “Stewart”).

Regarding claim 1, Stewart does not disclose a first conductive part provided in the casing so as to be exposed from a rear face of the casing, and a second conductive part provided in the casing so as to be exposed from a bottom face or side face of the casing,. According to Stewart, the PCB 615, which corresponds to the circuit board of the invention of claim 1, is mounted within the housing of a communication device, as Stewart describes, “A circuit board is mounted within the communication device body” (Stewart; column 1, lines 47-49, etc.). The shield can 621, which corresponds to the first and second conductive parts of the invention of claim 1, is coupled to the back of the PCB (Stewart, column 7, lines 50-51), and sandwiched between the PCB 615 and the rear section 610, as shown in Fig. 6a. Because the shield can 621 is mounted within the housing together with the PCB 615, it cannot be exposed either from a bottom face or side face of the housing, or from the rear section 610. In fact, there is no disclosure in Stewart that the shield can

621 is exposed from any portion of the housing. For example, Figs. 6a and 6b clearly show that the shield can 621 is covered with the rear section 610, and is not exposed from the rear section 610. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by the reference, claim 1 is not fully anticipated by Stewart. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 4-5 which are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Claims 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sadler et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,136,681; hereinafter "Sadler").

Regarding claim 6, Sadler does not disclose a conductor part provided between the rear face of the casing and the circuit board. Sadler's shield cans 1064 and 1066, which corresponds to the conductor part of the invention of claim 6, is not provided between the rear cover member 1020, which corresponds to the rear face of the casing, and the circuit board 1030, but is provided between the front cover assembly 1001 and the circuit board 1030. For that reason, the device disclosed in Sadler is structurally completely different from the device of claim 6. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 6 is not taught by the reference, claim 6 is not fully anticipated by Sadler. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 which are dependent from claim 6 should also be allowable for at least the same reason. In addition, regarding claim 7, Sadler does not disclose that the conductive board is arranged so as to be exposed from the rear face of the casing. The Office Action states that the brand portion of the conductive board is visible. However, Sadler only discloses that a portion of the conductive board is viewable through the LCD lens 112. Sadler does not disclose that the conductive board is exposed. Moreover, the LCD lens 112 is not located at the rear cover member 120, but at the front cover member 110. Therefore, the conductive board cannot be exposed from the rear cover member 120 even through the LCD lens.

Regarding claim 9, Sadler does not disclose a second conductive part provided between the rear face of the casing and the circuit board. Sadler's shield cans 1064 and 1066, which corresponds to the second conductive part of the invention of claim 9, is not provided between the rear cover member 1020, which corresponds to the rear face of the casing of the present invention, and the circuit board 1030, but is provided between the front cover assembly 1001 and the circuit board 1030

(Sadler, Fig. 13). For that reason, the device disclosed in Sadler is structurally completely different from the device of claim 9. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 9 is not taught by the reference, claim 9 is not fully anticipated by Sadler. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-14 which are dependent from claim 6 should also be allowable for at least the same reason. In addition, regarding claim 10, Sadler does not disclose that the first conductive part is provided in the casing so as to be exposed from the rear face of the casing, and the second conductive part is provided in the casing so as to be exposed from a bottom face or side face of the casing. Sadler's shield cans 1064 and 1066, which corresponds to the second conductive part of the invention of claim 10, is not exposed from the bottom face or side face of the casing, but is sandwiched between the front cover assembly 1001 and the circuit board 1030 (Sadler, Fig. 13). Also, the electrically conductive layer 1062, which corresponds to the first conductive part of the invention of claim 10, is not exposed from the rear cover member 1020, but is encased within the front cover member 1010, as shown in Fig. 13 of Sadler.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-38204.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: March 3, 2008